

Trust Your Perceptions

Semen: Men's Chemical War Against Women. Part III: Past Evolutionary Context for Seminal Engineering: how females not signaling estrus trumped males.

Posted on May 15, 2016 by [trustyourperceptions](#)

all original writing copyrighted, 2016, by Trust Your Perceptions

[No-Skip Intro here. \(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=153&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=153&preview=true) [Part I here.](#)
[\(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=188&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=188&preview=true) [Part II here.](#)
[\(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=218&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=218&preview=true) [Part IV here.](#)
[\(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=229&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=229&preview=true) [Part V here.](#)
[\(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=246&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=246&preview=true) [Appendix & References here.](#)
[\(https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=257&preview=true\)](https://trustyourperceptions.wordpress.com/?p=257&preview=true)

Human semen likely evolved into its modern state of fuckery in a freakout response to ancestral females who permanently turned off their fertile-now signal. Pre-human ancestral females evolving not to signal estrus was good news for females. – But for males, – it was a disaster.

Across species, most females on Earth signal estrus, – whether by swellings or scents or chems – in an attempt to accept males only when ovulating, and at no other time. Our closest primate cousins, for example, go pink-butt when fertile to give notice that they are now accepting applications. Most other primates do not signal with pink swellings, but by emitting scents or chems. Among mammals at large, only a handful – including humans, dolphins, vervet monkeys and gray langurs – do not signal estrus. Given how rare concealed estrus is, there must be some reason pre-human females evolved it.

Trust Your Perceptions will deal out the leading theories on how concealed estrus evolved (amazingly, most fail to grasp how evolution works, as these theorists aren't all biologists). Trust will also offer obvious explanations which no one seems to have considered.

Noonan (female) and Alexander (male) proposed females all-together willed themselves to stop signaling estrus to force males to be monogamous with them and co-parent. This “Paternal Investment Theory,”/“catch and keep a man *Cosmogirl* theory,” despite remaining a leading theory, does not work on two counts: First, some species

signaling estrus are monogamous and some species concealing estrus aren't monogamous (Wagner), meaning concealed estrus is not linked to monogamy. Second, evolution doesn't happen by willing a body function to stop. Symons (male) proposed less of a love story in his "Sex and Reward Hypothesis," suggesting males coming home from the hunt "exchanged" meat to fuck hungry females who were signaling estrus. Burger-crazed females then mimicked being hot for dudes continuously, the theory goes, so that estrus as a fixed event disappeared. Dude brilliance blinds. – Yet dude doesn't understand evolution: It does not work through *will*. A whole population of females can't mimic signaling estrus through sheer paleo-willpower until none of them is signaling estrus. Schroder (female) and also Etlin (male) proposed the "Social Bonding Hypothesis" in which females stopped signaling to win dude detente. Peacenik females, according to this theory, wanted dudes to stop fighting over fucking them and *just be friends*. Females collaboratively stopped signaling to put an end to male competition, the theory goes, and usher in a new era of male bonding. While it seems logical females would want males to stop killing for territory/resources/females themselves, a non-stop dude activity, females collaboratively and willfully not signaling in the name of world peace would be a matter of great biological interest, as this is not how evolution works. (Schroder also suggested it wasn't just world peace females wanted, but beta males' genes, – and by willfully concealing estrus a female could sneak "clandestine copulations" with beta males, duping alpha into not knowing who baby's poppa was (gosh, does this mean females *had no choice*? –) Though this is one of the only theories to hint at the extreme non-stop violence of males, evolution doesn't select for bromantic sex-ay endings just cuz it would make money at the box office. Mealey (female) recently offered a new theory, suggesting enlarged breasts have now evolved to replace pink-signaling estrus. (Does Trust even have to explain the *absurdity* here?)

Other slightly-less absurd theories, – all lacking in development however, – include Burley (female), who proposed females stopped signaling estrus through "abstinence." Burley theorized that because childbearing resulted so often in death, females, although still signaling estrus, decided to "abstain." – And that this collective refusal of dudes led the signaling of estrus, somehow, to stop.

This theory is kind of confusing because abstinence/no babies would mean no evolution, though fewer babies, which could increase the survival of both mother and babies, would work. But how a "No Means No" campaign could both stop the presumed physical swelling, and, – far less likely, – be honored by dudes, – remains sketchy.

The "Reduced Infanticide Theory" put forward by Hrdy (female) is probably the most favored theory at this time. This theory, unlike most theories here, actually takes the mechanics of evolution into account, and also, albeit indirectly, the male obsession with their Y. Males killed babies, Hrdy proposed, when they thought a baby wasn't "theirs." Females who were naturally better at concealing estrus could obscure who the father was, securing higher rates of survival for their offspring by confusing males into periods of non-murder. Hrdy further proposed that females who let many males fuck them were best able to survive because fucked females could enlist the help of many males in child rearing, – all these males apparently showing up for their shift – because baby could be "theirs."

Trust would like to point out that male cougars and other male mammals kill and even eat babies regularly, – whether "theirs" or not. – Biologists have not shown, to Trust's satisfaction, that males are in any way discriminating in their violence, – much less meticulously discriminating. (Biologists try to explain male violence as having biological utility, when holy-shit *obviously* male violence is a threat to the species itself). – And Trust not even gonna bother ridiculing the sexpozzie female gets herself a staff of babysitting dudes idea. – *Shiiit no*.

Trust will offer this footnote, though, on baby-killing males: Females may have started to feed males to get males to stop killing and maybe even eating their babies. (This was first proposed by the writer Soledad de Montalvo (female)). Though males kill everything and anything on a regular basis, toddlers, whether killed recreationally, or for toddler taretare, certainly would have alarmed.

food? – Why have males eaten first and most when it is females who should have nourishment-priority as Makers of the Species? Why do males not only have the universal right to critique food females hand them, but also the right to, if displeased, threateningly fume? In 2015 in Nigeria, for example, an actual public debate broke out over whether women should be “traditional” by letting males eat first. In some places, males had, and even still have, their own tables where women serve them food. If the table is shared, the male sits as “head,” expecting to be served first. It is common the world over for males to be served first, and to be handed the best food, the choice cuts. Any sensible mother should know her daughter is biologically far more important than any male at the table, and feed her daughters first. Yet mothers generally feed their husbands first, – the biologically most expendable and expensive one, – with males even known to get jealous of a baby being breastfed – the echo of male *threat* from epochs past... Women have become so inured to the ordinary male death threat that when pointed at them, they no longer experience it for what it is, but instead, as the sudden need to post-haste placate. Females try to quell male violence through appeasement. Handing dudes food looking like one-half of womens’ international campaign to plead for niceness from dudes. Here: Just please stop killing the children, *ok?*

Bolin and Wheelan (both female) and also Pawlowski (male) proposed that our hominid female ancestors’ signaling of estrus ended with bipedalism. Because the concomitant tilting of the female pelvis could, evolutionarily, over time, end signaling, this theory seems plausible. Yet there may be more here too.

No one seems to have wondered if pre-*Homo sapien* females initiated bipedalism, – if females stood up to get males off their backs. – Literally. – Females would have been sitting targets, a bent back a virtual “landing pad” for attacking males, – who could hold down females easily, as females’ eyes and arms faced away from the attacker, – who the female couldn’t even kick. Dude’s most vulnerable parts would not be accessible to crush, and so effectively used as a weapon. To stand up was to *remove the bent back*, to remove the landing pad for attacking males. Some females may have stood up in self-defense, and stayed standing up – to be better vigilant against marauding males, checking what creep be creeping up behind them, and be better able to physically fight off male attacks. Females may have even survived best by standing up to hide their swelling, and avoid the life-threatening horde. Those females who stood up *re-oriented their pelvis in relation to males*. Those females who stood up could have improved their survival, and the survival of their daughters – by lowering their death rate in any of these ways. (Biologist Tanner (female) suggested bipedalism evolved as a “male phallic display.” Why would males expose their greatest physical weakness and open themselves to comparison? They can’t even use a public urinal without going into distress). Clearly, once bipedalism was the norm, exposed male genitals let females know what dudes were up to. In this way, bipedalism was a reversal in females’ favor – hiding females’ genitals from males, with males now unable to conceal). Once females stood up, the physical shifting of the female pelvis was a profoundly radical evolutionary change. Considering how much death from child-bearing this pelvis-shift brought upon females, bipedalism could have easily been selected against, and so there must have been a strong impetus for females to overcome this, – and stay standing up.

*

Evolution works like this: Concealed estrus evolved because females who could naturally better conceal estrus were more likely to survive and/or females who signaled estrus did not survive. Obvious theories which have been overlooked include:

1). Females who signaled estrus died from being fucked to death by all males within 100 miles. Females murdered by rape-raging males is common across species. Ducks for example: “In several species of ducks, males frequently harass females on land, water, and in the sky. Males grasp at females with their beaks and attempt to mount them. It is not unusual for the antics (*sic*) of one pair (*sic*) to attract the attention of many more males, resulting in a mass of struggling males (*sic*) enveloping (*sic*) a single female in the middle. Struggles can be violent enough that females die.” (Arnqvist and Rowe) Or quolls: when females of this very old carnivorous marsupial species signal estrus simultaneously each winter, males go into a fuck-frenzy, trying to fuck as many females as possible, biting females

in the neck while dragging them off. When this shit is all over, it's a battlefield littered with corpses.

A variation on this theme is the killing of babies by males on rape stampedes. Two-thirds of seal pups are regularly trampled to death, for example, by stampeding males in a rape-craze. If females die, if babies die, or both, the genetic line shifts to surviving females who can successfully reproduce daughters who will also succeed in reproducing. Females who were naturally better at concealing estrus may have better avoided the homicidal man-gangs, passing their better-concealment genes down to their daughters.

Or 2): Females who signaled estrus died in too-high-an-incidence of childbirth. After all, childbirth would be like clockwork, no break. – Females would be “bred” every season. Females dying in high numbers from childbirth would make survival of offspring unlikely.

Or 3): Simultaneous birthing of babies as a result of synchronized signaling of estrus would be catastrophic when facing a limited food supply, abnormally severe environmental conditions, or a thousand other very bad scenes. Females all giving birth around the same time would be resource-demanding and high-risk. (Even all females pregnant at the same time could lead to all kinds of problems). Those females naturally better able to conceal estrus may have pregated out of sync with other females, giving their offspring a better chance to survive.

Or 4): Males battle it out. The biggest meanest prick wins. He fucks all the females. Resulting in bigger meaner prickbabies. Who grow into big pricks. Who battle it out. – The biggest meanest prick wins. He fucks all the females. Resulting in bigger meaner prickbabies. Who grow into big pricks. Who battle it out –

Having just one DNA alphadude “option” limits genetic diversity, which would weaken a group's ability to deal with constant biological adversity. If one generation = Alphamale + All the Females, and if Alphamale picked up HIV from raping monkeys in his spare time, for example, – everyone dies. Male biologists miss this because the Alphamale is their *Hero.* Females who could naturally conceal estrus from alphamales and mate with HIV-negative betamales, eg, could divert their tribe into concealed estrus in just *one generation*. (– C'mon young feminist women: You can see how stupid these theorists are. Take over Biology. Take over Genetics. *This world is yours*).

However concealed estrus evolved, once it took hold among females an estimated 4-6 million years ago, it was unprecedented and devastating for ancestral dude. As a genetic parasite who must make a female copy him, – who must make a female surrender her resources towards the continuation of his strange little sex chromosome, – dude was all-a-sudden locked outside in the night. Getting copied/resource-extracting females was now gonna be a long shot, – a total shot in the dark. This was “life-threatening” to males, a great biological threat, – utterly cataclysmic. Like all semen producers cross-species, ancestral males had of course always wielded female-targeting seminal chemicals, but males locked outside in the night faced this new era of dead-bolted females by refining their semen over millions of years into its modern state of high-level fuckery.

Posted in [concealed estrus](#), [evolution](#) Tagged [baby food](#) [bipedalism](#) [family](#) [infanticide](#) [leading theories of concealed estrus](#) [marriage](#) [ovulation](#) [trauma](#)

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#)